

Examiner states that:

"Applicant must attempt to point of the patentable novelty which is believed to exist for the other pending claims as well".

As far as Applicant understands, he has already pointed out such patentable novelty for the other pending claims, albeit not necessarily for each and every individual claim. Rather, it was done on basis of example.

Nevertheless, Applicant herewith provides a bit of further analysis and some additional arguments.

(a) With reference to the rejection of claim 13 over Nomura (or Schreiner), and with reference to his comments at the top of page 3 of his Amendment C, Applicant further points out a few additional facts well known to those of ordinary skill in the particular art pertinent hereto; which facts are these:

\* Although it normally takes a while after the base voltage (i.e., base drive) has been removed before the transistor becomes non-conductive, the process of becoming non-conductive is a gradual one, with current flowing through the transistor -- in ever-diminishing magnitude and/or with ever-increasing collector voltage -- until it has reached a state of being entirely non-conductive.

\* The time it takes for a bi-polar transistor to become entirely non-conductive depends very much on whether or not a reverse bias voltage (i.e., reverse base drive, which is equivalent to drawing current out of the base) is applied to the transistor's base. It also depends on the magnitude of such reverse bias voltage. If a reverse bias voltage of suitable magnitude is indeed applied, the time it takes for the transistor to become entirely non-conductive is shortened by a substantial amount.

That is, after the transistor's base drive (i.e., flow of forward base current) has been removed, the transistor will continue to conduct for some time, gradually requiring more collector voltage in order to carry the same amount of collector current, or -- conversely -- gradually carrying less and less collector current for a given magnitude of collector voltage.

With reference to Applicant's Fig. 3B, Applicant does provide the base with a reverse bias voltage; and -- with reference to his Fig. 3C -- he does provide for the transistor to become substantially non-conductive prior to the point in time where the magnitude of the transistor's collector voltage starts to increase.

(b) Exemplary claim 25 includes:

"inverter means ... operative to provide an alternating inverter voltage ... having ... an instantaneous magnitude that (i) during a first period, remains substantially constant at a negative level, (ii) during a second period, increases at a substantially constant rate, (iii) during a third period, remains substantially constant at a positive level, and (iv) during a fourth period, decreases at a substantially constant rate ...".

This feature is neither described nor suggested by Nomura or Schreiner.

In this connection, Examiner is asked to notice that the inverter of claim 25 provides an output voltage of waveform similar to that of Nomura's Fig. 2. However, Examiner should also take note of the fact that the waveform of Nomura's Fig. 2 is not the waveform of the inverter output voltage of Nomura's inverter circuits (e.g., the inverters of his Figs. 3A and 3B).

It is unclear what the waveforms are of the inverter output voltages associated with Nomura's and Schreiner's inverters. However, Applicant can not find in either Nomura or Schreiner any illustrations of inverter output voltage waveforms that look anything like the waveform defined in Applicant's claim 25. Nor can Applicant find in Nomura or Schreiner any disclosure or suggestion to the effect that any of the inverter output voltage waveforms would be similar to the waveform defined in Applicant's claim 25.

(c) In the penultimate paragraph of his Communication, Examiner states that:

"It is asserted that the waveforms were known since they are associated with the patented means by continuation of the patent application and it so seems likely that they are merely elaborated on in the current continuation. It is required that such facts be clarified."

Applicant interprets this statement to mean that Examiner believes that the "waveforms" (presumably referring to the waveform defined in claim 25) might be inherent or obvious on basis of prior claims 1-26 and 1-35 of Applicant's U.S. Patents Nos. 4,279,011 and 4,441,087, respectively.

Such belief is unfounded.

There is nothing whatsoever in any of prior claims 1-26 or 1-35 to suggest an inverter output voltage having a waveform such as that defined in Applicant's claim 25.

If Examiner were to continue to believe otherwise, he is requested to show exactly where in prior claims 1-26 or 1-35 such a waveform is suggested.